FROM

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:47PM P3

Award NASD Dispute Resolution

In the Matter of the Arbitration Between:

Estate of Theodore Lockrem, Claimant v. Prudential Securities, Inc., Gail Spicuzza-Zorn, and Pruco Securities Corporation, Respondents

Case Number: 00-04488

Hearing Site: Las Vegas, Nevada

REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES

For Claimant:

Samuel Y. Edgerton, Esq.

Nash & Edgerton

Hermosa Beach, California

For Respondents

Prudential Securities Inc. and

Pruco Securities Corporation:

Kimberly Wong, Esq. Keesal, Young & Logan

Long Beach, California

For Respondent Gail Spicuzza:

Gail Spicuzza-Zorn

Pro Se

Mc Cleary, Washington

CASE INFORMATION

Statement of Claim filed: November 17, 2000.

Claimant's Uniform Submission Agreement signed: October 30, 2000.

First Amended Statement of Claim filed: December 21, 2000.

Claimant's Amended Uniform Submission Agreement signed: January 22, 2001.

Second Amended Statement of Claim filed: April 26, 2001.

Statement of Answer filed by Respondent Prudential Securities, Inc.: February 1, 2001.

Respondent Prudential Securities, Inc.'s Uniform Submission Agreement signed: Not filed.

Statement of Answer filed by Pruco Securities Corporation: Not filed.

EXECT "ID"

S 00406

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:47PM P4

NASD Dispute Resolution
Arbitration No. 00-04488
Award Page 2 of 6

Respondent Pruco Securities Corporation's Uniform Submission Agreement signed: Not filed.

Statement of Answer by Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn: Not filed.

Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn's Uniform Submission Agreement signed: Not filed.

CASE SUMMARY

Claimant alleged breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, elder abuse, failure to supervise, misrepresentation, non-disclosure, unauthorized trading, omission of facts, conversion, and suitability in the trading purchase and sale of single issue equity securities, covered call options, straight options and naked options.

Respondents Prudential Securities, Inc. denied the allegations of wrongdoing set forth in the Claimant's Statement of Claim.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Claimant requested \$672,000.00 in compensatory damages, \$2,000,000.00 in punitive damages, interest at a rate of 10%, and costs, including attorney's fees.

Respondent Prudential Securities, Inc. requested dismissal of the Claimant's Statement of Claim in its entirety.

OTHER ISSUES CONSIDERED AND DECIDED

Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn did not file with the NASD Dispute Resolution a properly executed submission agreement and failed to file an Answer to the Claimant's Statement of Claim but is required to submit to arbitration pursuant to the Code and having answered the claim, appeared, and testified at the hearing, is bound by the determination of the Panel on all issues submitted.

On January 20, 2001 Respondents filed a motion to dismiss Claimant's Statement of Claim or in the alternative to change venue from Las Vegas to Hawaii. The Arbitration Panel, having reviewed the written and oral submissions of the parties denied both motions on July 17, 2002.

Respondent Pruco Securities Corporation filed, on March 29, 2001, a Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief in the United States District Court Central District of California. Respondent Pruco Securities Corporation requested that the court enter a declaratory judgment and an injunction against Claimant as follows: 1) that the court declare that the dispute is not

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:48PM PS

NASD Dispute Resolution Arbitration No. 00-04488 Award Page 3 of 6

properly arbitrable before NASD Dispute Resolution, Inc.; and 2) that the court enjoin Claimant from pursuing claims against Pruco before NASD Dispute Resolution.

The United States District Court Central District of California issued an order granting a preliminary injunction against Claimant on June 25, 2001.

The United States District Court Central District of California issued an order lifting the previously issued preliminary injunction and ordered that the matter be arbitrated through NASD Dispute Resolution on April 3, 2002.

On December 13, 2002, Claimant reached settlement on its claims against Respondents Prudential Securities, Inc. and Pruco Securities Corporation and asked that said Respondents be dismissed from this action.

On December 26, 2002, Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn submitted post-hearing documents renewing her objection made at the hearing stating that Claimant's Executor, Linda Arana, had no legal standing to assert Claimants claims in arbitration. The Arbitration Panel, having reviewed the written submissions of the parties and having deliberated on the matter on January 21, 2001, overruled Respondent Spicuzza-Zorn's renewed objection.

The parties agreed that the Award in this matter may be executed in counterpart copies or that a handwritten, signed Award may be entered.

<u>AWARD</u>

After considering the pleadings, testimony, and evidence presented at the hearing, and the post-hearing submissions, the Panel decided in full and final resolution of the issues submitted for determination as follows:

- 1) Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn is liable to and shall pay Claimant the sum of \$16,489.60 in compensatory damages. Compensatory damages take into account the settlement between Claimant and Respondents Prudential Securities Inc. and Pruco Securities Incorporated.
- Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn is liable to and shall pay Claimant the sum of \$53,700.00 in pre-judgment interest.
- 3) Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn is liable to and shall pay Claimant the sum of \$77,500.00 in attorney's fees, pursuant to HHRS \$480-13(g)(1).
- 4) Respondent Gail Spicuzza-Zorn is liable to and shall pay post-judgment interest at a rate of 10% per annum simple interest on the sum of \$16,489.60 from December 19, 2002, until the date payment of this Award is made in full.
- 5) All other relief requested and not expressly granted is denied.

FRÒM:

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:48PM P6

NASD Dispute Resolution Arbitration No. 00-04488 Award Page 4 of 6

FEES

Pursuant to the Code, the following fees are assessed:

Filing Fees

NASD Dispute Resolution received or will collect the non-refundable filing fees for each claim as follows:

Initial claim filing fee

=\$ 500.00

Member Fees

Member fees are assessed to each member firm that is either a party in the matter or an employer of a respondent associated person at the time of the events that gave rise to the dispute, claim, or controversy. Accordingly, the member firms Prudential Securities, Inc., and Pruco Securities Corporation are parties and the following fees are assessed:

Pruco Securities Corporation:

Member Surcharge Pre-Hearing Process Fee	= \$ 2,500.00 = \$ 600.00
Hearing Process Fee	=\$ 600.00 =\$ 4,500.00
Total Member Fees	= \$ 7,600.00

Prudential Securities, Inc.:

Member Surcharge	= \$ 2,500.00
Pre-Hearing Process Fee	= \$ 600.00
Hearing Process Fee	= \$ 4,500.00
Total Member Fees	= \$ 7,600.00

Forum Fees and Assessments

The Panel assessed a forum fee for each pre-hearing conference or hearing session conducted. A pre-hearing conference and hearing session is any meeting between the parties and the Chair or the parties and the Panel. The following fees are assessed:

Three (3) Pre-hearing confe	rence sessions with the H	Panel @ \$1,200.00/session	= \$ 3,600.00
Pre-hearing conferences:	May 1, 2001	1 session	•
	May 30, 2002	1 session	
	July 16, 2002	1 session	

FRÒM:

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:48PM P7

Award Page 5 of 6		•		
Eight (8) Hearing sessions @ \$1,200.00/session			= \$ 9,600.00	
Hearings:	December 16, 2002	2 sessions		
December 17, 2002 December 18, 2002 December 19, 2002		2 sessions		
		2 sessions		
	2 sessions			
Total Forum Fees			= \$13,200.00	
1. The Panel assessed the er	ntire amount of \$13,200.0	0 in forum fees to Res	spondent Gail	
Spicuzza-Zorn.		•		
	Fee Summa	TY.		
1. Claimant, Estate of Theo	dore Lockrem, is charged	with the following fe	es and costs:	
Initial Filing Fee			=\$ <u>500.00</u>	
Total Fees			= \$ 500.00	
Less payments	·		= \$ (1,700.00)	
Less payments Refund Due Claima	nt Estate of Theodore L	ockrem	= \$ (1,700.00) = \$ (1,200.00)	
Refund Due Claima	•		= \$ (1,200.00)	
Refund Due Claima	•		= \$ (1,200.00)	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S	•		= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs:	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S <u>Member Fees</u>	•		= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S <u>Member Fees</u> Total Fees <u>Less ayments</u>	•	with the following fee	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S <u>Member Fees</u> Total Fees <u>Less ayments</u>	ecurities, Inc. is charged v	with the following fee	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs:	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon	ecurities, Inc. is charged v	with the following fee	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00)	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secur	ecurities, Inc. is charged v	with the following fee	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secur Member Fees Total Fees Less payments	dent Prudential Securit	ies, Inc.	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = (14,600.00)	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secur Member Fees Total Fees Less payments	ecurities, Inc. is charged v	ies, Inc.	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = (14,600.00)	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secur Member Fees Total Fees Less payments	dent Prudential Securities Corporation, is charged with the corporation of the corporatio	ies, Inc. ged with the following orporation	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) s fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (14,600.00) = \$ (7,000.00)	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secun Member Fees Total Fees Less payments Refund Due Respon 4. Respondent, Gail Spicuzz Forum Fees	dent Prudential Securities Corporation, is charged with the corporation of the corporatio	ies, Inc. ged with the following orporation	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = (14,600.00) = \$ (7,000.00) costs = \$ 13,200.00	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secun Member Fees Total Fees Less payments Refund Due Respon 4. Respondent, Gail Spicuz:	dent Prudential Securities Corporation, is charged with the corporation of the corporatio	ies, Inc. ged with the following orporation	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = (14,600.00) = \$ (7,000.00) costs	
Refund Due Claima 2. Respondent, Prudential S Member Fees Total Fees Less ayments Refund Due Respon 3. Respondent, Pruco Secur Member Fees Total Fees Less payments Refund Due Respon 4. Respondent, Gail Spicuzz Forum Fees	dent Prudential Securities Corporation, is charged with the corporation of the corporatio	ies, Inc. ged with the following orporation	= \$ (1,200.00) s and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (12,100.00) = \$ (4,500.00) g fees and costs: = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ 7,600.00 = \$ (14,600.00) = \$ (7,000.00) costs = \$ 13,200.00	

All balances are payable to NASD Dispute Resolution and are due upon the receipt of the Award pursuant to Rule 10330(g) of the Code.

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:49PM P8

NASII Dispute Resolution Arbitection No. 00-04488 Award Page 6 of 6

ARBITRATION PANEL

Michael B. Luikln. Esq. Thomas L. Flattery, Esq. Vernon Barman Public Arbitrator, Presiding Chair Public Arbitrator Non-Public Arbitrator

Concurring Arbitrators' Signatures

MICHAEL B. LARGN, ESQ. Clair Public Arbitrator 2 - 7 - 03 Signature Date

THOMAS L. FLATTERY, ESQ. Public Arbitrator

•

٠

Bignature Date

VERNON BARNUM Non-Public Arbitrator Signature Date

Data of Strains

Case 1:04-cv-00205-DAE-BMK Page 7 of 9 Document 76-11 Filed 10/17/2006 FROM: FAX NO. : Mar. 28 2003 04:49PM P9 NASD Dispute Resolution Arbitration No. 00-04488 Award Page 6 of 6 ARBITRATION PANEL Michael B. Laikin, Esq. Thomas L. Flauery, Esq. Public Arbitrator, Presiding Chair Public Arbitrator Vernon Barnuni Non-Public Arbitrator Concurring Arbitrators' Signatures MICHAEL B. LAIKIN, ESQ. Signature I late Chair, Public Arbitrator

THOMAS L. FLATTERY, ESQ.

Public Arbitrator

VERNON BARNUM Non-Public Arbitrator Signature Date

2/8/03

Signature Date

Date of Service

Case 1:04-cv-00205-DAE-BMK

Document 76-11

Filed 10/17/2006

Page 8 of 9

FROM:

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:50PM P10

NASD Dispute Resolution Arbitration No. 00-04488 Award Page 6 of 6

ARBITRATION PANEL

Michael B. Laikin, Esq. Thomas L. Flattery, Esq. Vernon Barnum

Public Arbitrator, Presiding Chair Public Arbitrator Non-Public Arbitrator

Concurring Arbitrators' Signatures

MICHAEL B. LAIKIN, ESQ. Chair, Public Arbitrator

Signature I)ate

THOMAS L. FLATTERY, ESQ. Public Arbitrator

Signature Date

VERNON BARNUM Non-Public Arbitrator

Date of Service

FAX NO. :

Mar. 28 2003 04:50PM P11



Proof of Service

State of California, County of Los Angeles

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles. I declare that I am over the age of eighteen (18) and not a party to this action. My business address is:

NASD Dispute Resolution, Inc. 300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 9007L

On February 10, 2003, I served the following documents described as:

Award, Cover Letters, and Invoice Statement for Arbitration Case No. 00-04488 on the interested parties in this action by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in the sealed envelopes as follows:

Samuel Edgerton, Esq. Nash & Edgerton, 2615 Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 322, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Kimberly Wong, Esq., Keesal, Young & Logan, 400 Oceangate, Long Beach, CA 90802

Gail Spicuzza, P.O. Box 1469, Mc Cleary, WA 98557

х	I deposited such envelop in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.
	By Personal Service, I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the individuals at the addressee(s) listed.
	By overnight courier, I caused the above-referenced documents to be delivered to an overnight courier service (Federal Express), for delivery to the above addressees.
	By facsimile machine, I caused the above-referenced documents to be transmitted to the above-named persons at the numbers above.
x	(STATE) I declare under penalty of perjure under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
	(FEDERAL) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar on this court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed this February 10, 2003, at Los Angeles, California

Yoshawn Prater